



Continuation of rejections discussed: The withdrawal of finality based on applicant's arguments filed in the Appeal Brief of 01/22/2004; with a restriction requirement between the the MRI gradient assembly switching claims (i.e. claims 10-23 and 25-28 of class 324/318-322) and claims 1-3, and 4-9 which are drawn to an arbitrary linear switching circuit where the magnitude of the current between an arbitrary source and an arbitrary load causes the switching of the switching circuit, without requiring any magnetic resonance gradient system components. Art for the non-MRI restricted claims (i.e. claims 1-3, and 5-9) is found in class/subclasses 361/20, 100; 327/461; 318/138; and 307/417.

Continuation of claims discussed: claims 1-3, and 5-9 subject to a restriction requirement; claims 10-23 and 25-28 based on applicant's filed Appeal brief, and the remaining issues between the prior art and claims 10-23, and 25-28, given applicant's election of claims 10-23 and 25-28 without traverse, and cancellation of claims 1-3, and 5-9 via examiner's amendment. .

Continuation of Identification of prior art discussed: The prior arts of record and the fact that the Independent MRI claims, (i.e. claims 10, 18, and 23) did not require the exclusion of additional external components providing input to the switching magnitude between the MRI gradient assembly components as argued by applicant in the filed Appeal Brief. The examiner offered to make an examiner's amendment to the title of the application; and the pending MRI claims 10-23 and 25-28, to clarify the applicant's argued feature of novelty (i.e. that the switching device's first portion was "dependent only on the magnitude of a current applied to the gradient coil assembly by the driving amplifier" within the limitations claimed by applicant. The attorney agreed to the examiner's amendment in order to place the application in condition for allowance, and resolve the remaining outstanding issues. [See the examiner's amendment to claims 10, 18, and 23 of the instant application.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant agreed with the examiner's telephonic restriction requirement, without traverse, and elected the MRI claims 10-23 and 25-28 for further prosecution by the examiner. The attorney gave the examiner permission to cancel the non-elected claims (i.e. claims 1-3, and 5-9) by examiner's Amendment, correct the title, and amend claims 10, 18, and 23 as discussed in the telephonic interviews. [See the letter of April 8th 2004].